

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for his careful and thorough Office Action.

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application. All claims were rejected.

Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 13, and 15 were rejected as anticipated by *Abadi et al.* (USP 5,173,939, hereinafter "Abadi"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1, 16, and 17 each require "a contact list comprising information identifying one or more other entities which have attempted to communicate with the given entity". This limitation is not taught or suggested by any cited art, and so all claims should be allowed over the art of record.

In particular, while Abadi does describe the use of an access control list to control access to objects in a distributed computer system, Abadi's access control list does NOT "identify one or more other entities which have attempted to communicate with the given entity." Rather, Abadi's list appears to function as a conventional access list, which prescribes which principals are to be given access in the future (as opposed to entities that have already attempted to communicate).

Further, nothing in Abadi teaches or suggests a "revocation list" as described in each of these independent claims. Although the Office Action alleges that one of skill in the art could modify Abadi's contact list to act as a revocation list, nothing in Abadi has been shown to motivate one of

skill in the art to do so. Moreover, the independent claims were rejected as anticipated by Abadi, and so the rejection must show that every limitation is actually shown in the reference (or inherent to the reference), not that the reference could arguably be modified to fit the claim limitations.

Finally, with regard to claims 1, 16, and 17, the independent claims each require both a contact list and a revocation list. Nothing in any cited art teaches or suggests both these lists.

Other claims include similar distinctions over the cited art, but as each of the independent claims has been shown to be allowable over all cited art, these arguments need not be made. All anticipation rejections have been traversed, and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6, 7, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abadi in view of *Kingdon* (USP 5,677,851, hereinafter “Kingdon”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In light of the above arguments, showing specific limitations of the independent claims not taught or suggested by Abadi or Kingon, the obviousness rejections are believed to be moot. All rejections have been traversed, and reconsideration and allowance is requested.

SUMMARY


If any issues arise, or if the Examiner has any suggestions for expediting allowance of this Application, the Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below or at *dvenglarik@davismunck.com*.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees connected with this communication or credit any overpayment to Davis Munck Deposit Account No. 50-0208.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVIS MUNCK, P.C.

Date: 2-12-04



Daniel E. Venglarik
Registration No. 39,409

P.O. Drawer 800889
Dallas, Texas 75380
(972) 628-3600 (main number)
(972) 628-3616 (fax)
E-mail: *dvenglarik@davismunck.com*